



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNited STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER PCR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,547	11/06/2001	Yuan-Hsun Wu	B-4370 619282-1	4698

7590 09/23/2003

Richard P. Berg, Esq.
c/o LADAS & PARRY
Suite 2100
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

ESPLIN, DAVID B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2851

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/035,547	WU, YUAN-HSUN
Examiner	Art Unit	
D. Ben Espin	2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
 |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the mask shop (claim 1), and a sensing or detecting means required by the step of measuring the light intensities (claim 1) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification and drawings contain no teaching regarding a method of measuring the first, second, and/or third light intensities such that the area measured could be restricted to the areas (intensity1-intensity3). Further, the disclosure does not teach of a light source, or light sources, instead

stating only that the intensities of opaque areas of the mask should be measured. Thus, it would not have been apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art what type of sensors should be used to measure the intensity, the relative size of the sensors needed, whether the light intensities should be measured one the side of the mask that light is incident or on the opposite side, and any sort of optical processing (via lenses, apertures, etc.) that might be needed between the mask and the sensors for the method to be employed. Also, one skilled in the art would have been at a loss as to what type of light source(s), if any, should be employed, where they should be located with respect to the mask, and what, if any, sort of optical processing the light would be needed prior to making the light incident on the mask.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Reference in claim 1 to the first-third light intensities of different areas of the mask is read by Examiner as unclear language as it is not clear from the claims, in light of the specification and drawings, whether these intensities refer to intensities corresponding to transmissive, reflective, and/or absorptive properties of these areas of the mask based on some sort of incident light from a light source, or three different light sources, or perhaps utilizes only ambient light.

Referring specifically to claim 2, Examiner finds the use of the shorthand 3δ to be unclear. This term is also used in the specification with no explanation as to its meaning. Within

the field of optics and statistics there are many different functions, variables, and constants that are denoted by δ . Further, the addition of a 3 in front of the δ does not, to Examiner's knowledge limit these possible meanings.

Due to the inadequacy of the disclosure, and the vagueness of the claim language, these claims have not been further prosecuted on their merits.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,114,073 to Yang discloses a method for mask repair including a mask shop.

U.S. Patent No. 6,381,356 to Murakami et al. discloses a mask inspection method including measuring light intensities of a mask.

U.S. Patent No. 6,322,935 to Smith discloses a mask repair method including the step of evaluating the effectiveness of a mask shop.

U.S. Patent No. 6,023,328 to Pierrat discloses a mask inspection apparatus including detecting light intensities of different sections of a mask.

U.S. Patent No. 6,076,465 to Vacca et al. discloses a method for evaluating the defects that have been detected in a mask to determine if a mask is usable.

U.S. Patent No. 6,297,879 to Yang et al. discloses a method including a mask shop, inspection of light intensities of a mask, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the mask shop.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Ben Esplin whose telephone number is (703) 305-4022. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (8am-4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russell E. Adams can be reached on (703) 308-2847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.


DBE


RUSSELL E. ADAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800